

Original Research Article

The Prevalence of Methicillin Resistant Staphylococcus Aureus (MRSA) and its Antimicrobial Susceptibility Pattern at Tertiary Care Hospital

Nisarg Trivedi, Mitesh Kamothi*, Bhavesh Gohil

Department of Microbiology, GMERS Medical College, Gotri, Vadodara, Gujarat

*Correspondence: Dr Mitesh Kamothi (drmiteshkamothi@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT

Background: Staphylococcus aureus is a very common human pathogen isolated from various clinical specimens. Staphylococcus aureus can cause various infectious diseases like endocarditis, skin and soft tissue infections, osteomyelitis, pneumonia and bacteremia. Methicillin resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) can cause a major trouble mostly in tertiary care center. The present study is aimed to determine the prevalence of Methicillin Resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) and its antimicrobial susceptibility pattern at Tertiary Care Hospital, Vadodara.

Material and Methods: Present study was conducted from October 2023 to April 2024 at tertiary care hospital, Vadodara. Total 1127 clinical specimens were tested for the study. The isolates were identified as per laboratory standard protocol including staining, colony morphology & biochemical reactions. All isolates were subjected to antibiogram study by modified Kirby Bauer disk diffusion method. Among 1127 clinical specimens, 361 Staphylococcus aureus were isolated and tested for MRSA by Cefoxitin disc diffusion test.

Results: Among 361 Staphylococcus aureus isolates, 159 were positive for MRSA. Overall prevalence rate for MRSA isolates was 44.04%. Maximum number of MRSA was isolated in Orthopedic ward (53, 33.33%), Surgery ward (39, 24.52%), Intensive Care Unit (28, 17.61%), Medicine ward (17, 10.69%) Pediatric ward (15, 9.43%). Maximum MRSA isolated from Pus and swab (81, 50.94%) followed by Urine (36, 22.64%), Blood (27, 16.98%). MRSA were most sensitive to Vancomycin (159, 100%) followed by Teicoplanin (149, 93.71%), Linezolid (142, 89.30%), Clindamycin (71, 44.65%) and least sensitive to Ciprofloxacin (29, 18.23%) followed by Erythromycin (42, 26.41%) and Gentamycin (62, 38.99%).

Conclusion: Prevalence of MRSA in our study is 44.04%, which are multidrug resistance though Vancomycin, Linezolid and Teicoplanin are still effective treatment option. Screening of MRSA and their antibiogram is very essential for early detection of MRSA and for management of the condition.

Keywords: Antimicrobial resistance, MRSA, Vancomycin

INTRODUCTION

Staphylococcus aureus (S. aureus) is a member of family Micrococcaceae. They are gram-positive cocci, spherical in shape, arranged characteristically in grape like clusters. The characteristic grape like cluster is due to the cell division occurring in three planes, with daughter tending to remain in close to each other.

Infections caused by S. aureus include, skin and soft tissue lesion like abscesses and carbuncles, osteomyelitis, pyoderma, pneumonia, endocarditis and septicemia.¹ Staphylococcus aureus bacteria have a long history as a cause of human disease around the world. Invasive S. aureus infections were almost always fatal in prior antibiotic era. The introduction of penicillin greatly improved prognosis for these serious

cases of infection; however, resistant strains of bacteria appeared within a few years, due to bacterial production of β -lactamases. In 1960, methicillin was introduced as an alternative treatment for penicillin-resistant bacteria, but in 1961, the first case of MRSA has been reported. Methicillin resistance in the *Staphylococcus aureus* is develop by mutation in *mecA* gene, which make changes to penicillin-binding protein (PBP) present on *S. aureus* cell membrane to PBP2a.^{2,3} Because of this change the new penicillin-binding protein binds beta-lactam antibiotics with lower avidity and results in resistance to all the antimicrobial agents of that class and leads to limited antimicrobial options for this pathogen. Clindamycin was used as alternative in treatment of MRSA, but clindamycin resistance cases were also increase in last 10 year.⁴ Now a day vancomycin widely used antibiotic for management of MRSA. But resistance towards vancomycin has been reported in many studies.⁵

MRSA are of two types, HA & CA. HA means 'Hospital Associated' or 'Hospital Acquired' and CA means 'Community Associated' or 'Community Acquired'. CA also known as 'Community onset' or 'Community derived'. For the Active Bacterial Core Surveillance Program, the CDC has defined a community-associated MRSA (CA-MRSA) case as a patient with a MRSA infection and no history of the surgery, hospitalization, residence in a long-term health care facility or dialysis within one year prior to infection; has no percutaneous device or indwelling catheter; hospitalization < 48 hours before the culture; or no history of previous MRSA infection or colonization.⁶ While a case of HA-MRSA can be defined as any MRSA infection that does not qualify as CA-MRSA. MRSA can be detected in the lab by using cefoxitin disc as per CLSI guidelines. It can also be detected by Nucleic acid amplification tests, like polymerase chain reaction (PCR), which can detect the *mecA* gene.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

This study was conducted at from October 2023 to April 2024 at tertiary care hospital, Vadodara. Total 1127 Clinical specimens were tested in the study. The isolates were identified as per laboratory standard protocol including staining, colony morphology & biochemical reactions. All the clinical samples were inoculated into nutrient agar, sheep blood agar, and mannitol salt agar plates. All were incubated aerobically at 37°C for 24 hours. Next day, identified the isolates by performing Gram staining and colony characteristics. Isolated colonies were processed for

various biochemical tests like catalase test, Coagulase test (Both slide and tube). All isolates were subjected to antibiogram study by modified Kirby Bauer disk diffusion method. Among 1127 clinical specimens, 361 *Staphylococcus aureus* were isolated and tested for MRSA by Cefoxitin disc diffusion test. Mueller Hinton Agar (MHA) plates were inoculated with standardized inoculum (0.5 Mc Farland standard) of the *Staphylococcus aureus* by sterile swab. A 30 μ g cefoxitin disc was placed in the center of the plate. Plates were incubated at 37° C for 24 h and zone diameters were measured as per CLSI guidelines.⁷ The zone diameter must be measured in reflected light. An inhibition zone diameter of ≤ 22 mm was reported as methicillin resistant and ≥ 22 mm was considered as methicillin susceptible. As a Quality control strains, Methicillin sensitive *S. aureus* (MSSA) ATCC 25923 and methicillin resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) ATCC 43300 were used.

RESULTS

1127 clinical specimens were received during October 2023 to April 2024 at tertiary care hospital, Vadodara. Out of 1127 clinical specimens, 361 *Staphylococcus aureus* and 159 MRSA were isolated. Thus, overall prevalence rate for MRSA isolates was 44.04%. Maximum number of MRSA were isolated from the in patients (123, 77.35 %) than out patients (36, 22.64 %) (Table-1). Most number of MRSA were isolated from old age patients (> 60 years) was 66 (41.50%) followed by 46 - 60 years of age group (42, 26.41%), 0 - 15 years of age group (31, 19.49%), 31 - 45 years of age group (14, 8.8%) and in 16 - 30 years of age group (6, 3.77%) (Table-2). Maximum numbers of MRSA were isolated from Orthopedics ward (53, 33.33%), Surgery ward (39, 24.52%), Intensive Care Unit (28, 17.61%), Medicine ward (17, 10.69%) Pediatric ward (15, 9.43%) and Others (7, 4.4%) (Table-3). Maximum numbers of MRSA were isolated from Pus and swab (81, 50.94%) followed by Urine (36, 22.64%), Blood (27, 16.98%), Sputum (9, 5.66%) and Others (6, 3.77%) (Table-4). Maximum numbers of MRSA were most sensitive to Vancomycin (159, 100%) followed by Teicoplanin (149, 93.71%), Linezolid (142, 89.30%), Clindamycin (71, 44.65%) and least sensitive to Ciprofloxacin (29, 18.23%) followed by Erythromycin (42, 26.41%) and Gentamycin (62, 38.99) (Table-5).

Table-1: OPD & IPD wise distribution of MRSA

OPD	36 (22.64%)
IPD	123 (73.35%)

Table-2: Age wise distribution of MRSA

Age Group	MRSA % (n=159)
0 - 15	19.49 % (31)
16 - 30	3.77 % (6)
31 - 45	8.8 % (14)
46 - 60	26.41 % (42)
> 60	41.50 % (66)

Table-3: Ward wise distribution of MRSA

Ward	Number	%
Orthopedics	53	33.33
Surgery	39	24.52
Intensive Care Unit (ICU)	28	17.61
Medicine	17	10.69
Pediatric	15	9.43
Others	7	4.4
Total	159	100

Table 4: Specimen wise distribution of MRSA

Specimen	Number	%
Pus and Swab	81	50.94
Urine	36	22.64
Blood	27	16.98
Sputum	9	5.66
Other	6	3.77
Total	159	100

Table-5: Antibiotic Sensitivity Pattern of MRSA

Antibiotic	Sensitive (n=159)	Resistant (n=159)
Vancomycin	159 (100%)	0
Linezolid	142 (89.3%)	17 (10.69%)
Teicoplanin	149 (93.71%)	10 (6.28%)
Clindamycin	71 (44.65%)	88 (55.34%)
Co-trimoxazole	68 (42.76%)	91 (57.23%)
Ciprofloxacin	29 (18.23%)	130 (81.76%)
Gentamycin	62 (38.99%)	97 (61.01%)
Erythromycin	42 (26.41%)	117 (73.58%)

Table-6: Prevalence of MRSA in different studies

Author	Prevalence
Chaudhary et al ¹³ (2022)	57.82%
Lohan K et al ⁹ (2020)	33.7%
Gupta S et al ¹ (2024)	45.5%
Kaup Set al ¹¹ (2017)	45.42%
Archana G et al ¹² (2022)	56.79%
Avinash K ¹⁴ (2018)	60.9%
Sharlee R et al ¹⁰ (2020)	43.3%
Pradeep K et al ⁸ (2021)	29.1%
Present Study	44.04%

Table-7: Comparison of Antibiotic-Resistant Pattern of MRSA in different studies

Antibiotic	Present Study	Lohan K et al ⁹	Gupta S et al ¹	Kumar G et al ¹⁶	Prashant A et al ¹⁵
Vancomycin	0	12.3%	0	-	0
Linezolid	10.69%	7.4%	6.8%	0	-
Teicoplanin	6.28%	12.3%	5.1%	-	-
Clindamycin	55.34%	66.7%	53%	56.4%	58.5%
Co-trimoxazole	57.23%	53.1%	45.3%	33.4%	61.1%
Ciprofloxacin	81.76%	59.2%	74.4%	53.8%	80.5%
Gentamycin	61.01%	46.9%	56.4%	32.1%	27.4%
Erythromycin	73.58%	76.5%	67.5%	82.1%	79.8%

DISCUSSION

The pathogenic organisms and their antibiotic sensitivity patterns may change from time to time and place to place. The prevalence rate of MRSA in present study was 44.04%, is compared with the different studies in Table-6. It is higher than the study of Pradip K et al⁸ (29.1%), Lohan K et al⁹ (33.7%) and Sharlee R et al¹⁰ (43.3%), almost similar to the study of Kaup S et al¹¹ (45.42%) and Gupta S et al¹ (45.5%), while few studies like Archana et al¹² (56.79%), Chaudhary et al¹³ (57.82%) and Avinash Kumar et al¹⁴ (60.9%) showed much higher prevalence rates. Table-7 shows the comparison of antibiotic resistance pattern of MRSA with other studies. In our study, MRSA was found most sensitive to Vancomycin (159, 100%) followed by Teicoplanin (149, 93.71%), Linezolid (142, 89.30%), Clindamycin (71, 44.65%). In our study, Vancomycin showed 100% sensitivity to MRSA similar results were found by Gupta S et al¹ and Prashant A et al¹⁵. While study of Lohan K et al⁹ showed 12.3% resistant. In our study, Teicoplanin (149, 93.71%) showed higher sensitivity than the study of Lohan K⁹ (12.3% Resistant) and almost

similar to Gupta S et al¹ (5.1% Resistant). In our study, Linezolid (142, 89.30%) showed less sensitivity than the study of Lohan K et al⁹ (7.4% Resistant) and Gupta S et al¹ (6.8% Resistant).

CONCLUSIONS

Irrational and inappropriate use of antimicrobials medicines provides favorable conditions for resistant microorganisms to emerge, spread and persist and is by far the biggest driver of drug resistance worldwide. No action today means no cure tomorrow. According to our study, Vancomycin is the only antimicrobial agent which showed 100% sensitivity even with multi drug resistance isolates. Vancomycin remains the first choice of treatment for MRSA. Vancomycin use should be limited to those cases where there are clearly needed. Screening of MRSA and their antibiogram is very essential for early detection of MRSA and for management of the condition. For prevention of MRSA, we can do regular screening of health care workers, hand hygiene practice, implementation of antibiotic policy, antimicrobial stewardship and strengthened infection control practices at least in tertiary care hospitals.

REFERENCES

1. Gupta S, Pandya H, Patel R. Prevalence of Methicillin Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) in different clinical samples in tertiary hospital Piparia, Vadodara, Gujarat. *African Journal of Biological Science*. 2024 Oct 6;6(10):4471–81. <https://doi.org/10.48047/AFJBS.6.10.2024.4471-4481>
2. Hiramatsu K, Cui L, Curods M. The emergence and evolution of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Trends in Microbiology*. 2001 Oct 1;9(10):486–93. doi:10.1016/s0966-842x(01)02175-8.
3. Sievert D. M., Rudrik J. T., Patel J. B., McDonald L. C., Wilkins M. J., Hageman J. C. Vancomycin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in the United States, 2002–2006. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2008 March 1;46(5):668–674.
4. Prabhu K., Rao S., Rao V. Inducible clindamycin resistance in *Staphylococcus aureus* isolated from clinical samples. *Journal of Laboratory Physicians*. 2011 Jan 3;3(1):25–27. doi: 10.4103/0974-2727.78558.
5. Kshetry AO, Pant ND, Bhandari R, et al. Minimum inhibitory concentration of vancomycin to methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* isolated from different clinical samples at a tertiary care hospital in Nepal. *Antimicrobial Resistance & Infection Control*. 2016 Jul 21;5:27. doi:10.1186/s13756-016-0126-3.
6. Buck JM, Como-Sabetti K, Harriman KH, Danila RN, Boxrud DJ, Glennen A, et al. Community-Associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*, Minnesot, 2000 - 2003. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 2005 Oct 5; 11(10):1532-1538.
7. CLSI. Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing. 31st ed. CLSI supplement, M100. Clinical and Laboratory standard institute; 2021.
8. Pradip K, Geeta G, Gajendra G. Prevalence of MRSA and Antimicrobial Susceptibility *Staphylococcus aureus* in Clinical Samples in National Capital Region, India. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International*. 2021 Dec 16; 33(59A): 209-215
9. Lohan K, Sangwan J, Mane P, Lathwal S. Prevalence pattern of MRSA from a rural medical college of North India: A cause of concern. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care* 2021 Feb 27;10(2):752-757.doi:10.4103/jfmpe.jfmpe_1527_20.
10. Sharlee R, Sumangala B. Prevalence of Methicillin Resistance *Staphylococcus aureus* in Teaching Hospital, Karnataka, India. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 2020 Feb 22; 9(3): 2837-2843. doi. org/10.20546/ijemas.2020.903.327
11. Kaup S, Roopashree S and Balasubrahmanya, H. 2017. Prevalence and Antibiogram of Methicillin Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in a Tertiary Care Centre in Tumkur, India. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences* 2020 Sep 17 6(9):2236-2243. doi: <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijemas.2017.609.274>
12. Archana G, Laxmi A, Mamta G. A Study on the Prevalence and Susceptibility Pattern of MRSA in a Tertiary Care Hospital of Haroti Region. *International Journal of Medical Laboratory* 2022 Nov 30;9(4):272-277.

13. Chaudhury N., Biswas T., Mondal R., Chatterjee A, Chattopadhyay S and Nag S. Antibiotic susceptibility and prevalence of Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in different clinical isolates in a tertiary care hospital. *Asian Journal of Medical Sciences*. 2022 Jun 1;13(6): 101–107. DOI: doi.org/10.3126/ajms.v13i6.43027.

14. Avinash K, Anshul K. Prevalence of Methicillin Resistant *Staphylococcus Aureus* (MRSA) In A Secondary Care Hospital In North Eastern Part of India. *Archives of Infect Diseases & Therapy* 2018 Apr 24;2(1):1-2.

15. Prashant A, Deepak B, Junu R, Laxman B. Prevalence, antimicrobial susceptibility pattern and multidrug resistance of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* isolated from clinical samples at a tertiary care teaching hospital: an observational, cross- sectional study from the Himalayan country, Nepal. *BMJ Open* 2023 Dec 14;13:e067384. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2022-067384

16. Kumar G, Yadav R. Prevalence of MRSA in ICU in a Tertiary Care Hospital. *Annals of International Medical & Dental Research* 2019 Jun 20; 5(4): MB19-MB22.

Source of support: Nil

Conflict of interest: Nil

How to cite: Trivedi N, Kamothi M, Gohil B. The Prevalence of Methicillin Resistant *Staphylococcus Aureus* (MRSA) and its Antimicrobial Susceptibility Pattern at Tertiary Care Hospital. *GAIMS J Med Sci* 2025;5(1):182-186.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14934306>